

MINUTES 131ST FC MEETING – 1 SEPTEMBER 2011

Attendees

FC Members	Guests	MT	Official Secretary
Juup Essers	Ad Scheepers	Koos Hogervorst	Joy Kearney
Guido Berens	Janet van der Woude	Frank van der Kruk	
Bernardo Lima	Thessa Lageman (ER)		
Sharmayne Schneiderberg			
Marlies Koolhaas			
Tom Mom			
Jan Sirks			
Martine Schey			

1. Opening

Juup opens the meeting officially at 10.30am and welcomes everyone.

2. Agenda

There are no extra points added to the agenda.

3. Minutes

The meeting minutes of 31 May 2011 are approved.

4. Announcements

The FC makes one announcement:

1. The outgoing FC officially hand over to the incoming FC. Guido states the outgoing FC have been dealing with the budget approval and therefore will take part in approving this issue.

5. Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER)

Ad Scheepers referred to the letter from the FC (5 July) and the reasoning behind the FC's disagreement with the plan to limit the number of re-sits in the first year. He cited three sources as mentioned in the OCPC advice regarding the proposed re-sit rule in the TER. Several members are opposed to this rule. It concerns 'very extreme individual circumstances'. They must also announce this before declining to sit the exams. Tom Mom made the point that it is clear this will not help the students we have in mind as it is only after the examination rounds that the damage concerning exams not passed becomes clear. Why make it so difficult? Students who pass more than five re-sits will be victimised by the suggested change. Tom was not very much impressed by the statistics of the EC, neither was Juup by the references put forward.

Regarding the limiting of re-sits issue; there is a hardship clause for individual cases:

- If a student refers to this hardship clause on time (i.e. before they decide not to participate in the regular exam and thus have to rely on the re-sit), the Examination Board will examine his/her case with the utmost care. Martine states that if students apply for this in a timely manner (before they take part in the exams and are thus advised to re-sit), the Exam Committee will look at this issue more closely. Martine will monitor this process.
- In very exceptional individual circumstances, in which application of one or more of the provisions set out in these regulations leads to evidently unreasonable and/or unfair situations with regard to a student, a student can submit a request in writing, and with reasons, for derogation from the said provision(s) to the

Examination Board. The Examination Board may, after consulting the relevant examiner(s) and the student advisor or student counsellor, derogate from the said provision(s) in favour of the student. A decision to reject the student's request will not be made by the Examination Board until the applicant has been given the opportunity to present his or her case, if this is requested. Martine suggests to the FC that they again read the letter from Ad with this in mind and reconsider their decision.

Guido thinks it seems that the measure is intended to eliminate weaker students. According to Ad Scheepers the exact opposite is true: it concerns the context of the new 60 ECTS-measure, reducing the number of drop-outs caused by discouraging procrastinating behaviour. It seems that the same effect cannot be achieved by means of other measures (though apparently not all student members are in agreement here). It would seem that the implementation of only the 60 ECTS measure will at least initially mean that more will drop out, including people that could have passed if they had planned their studies better. The biggest objection of the student members is that students who are involved in student societies activities not directly connected with study will be victimised by this, which can have a negative effect on Rotterdam student life. Some committee-tasks are so demanding that they take a lot of time away from study. Martine and Ad state that it is not possible to guarantee this since the applicability of the hardship clause differs per individual case. We thus agree in principle with the proposal if we can have some kind of assurance from the EC that they will take into account committee work in student societies (and not only study groups). But that does not seem to be so easy; Martine will discuss this with the EC in the short term and report back.

6. Budget plan for 2012

Koos Hogervorst introduces the Budget Plan and apologises for the delay. The problem is that this has caused an overlap as the old FC is now handling it instead of the new FC. Juup made the point that this is not exactly legal or satisfactory since the official handover has now taken place, but is willing to overlook this on this occasion given the circumstances.

7. Proposal for an interactive FC weblog

Juup suggests the FC should have a weblog on which ideas/information/opinions can be exchanged. This should be interactive. A provisional set-up will be distributed by Juup to the members. We will discuss this with Marketing and Communication and Juup will make an official proposal and send it to all members. There is general agreement for this idea.

8. Any other business

No further topics for discussion.

9. Closure

Juup closes the meeting at 13.00 hrs.

Next FC meeting 20 September 2011 10.30 am in T03-42.

To do before the next meeting

Task	Person Responsible	Progress
Follow up on resit issue	Martine	Next meeting
Weblog proposal	Juup	Pending